

Title			
Challenge area:	<input type="checkbox"/> Student Readiness <input type="checkbox"/> Affordability <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Institutional Capacity & Student Success <input type="checkbox"/> Capturing the Potential of Technology <input type="checkbox"/> Stable and Accountable Funding	Staff lead:	Jim West
		Position	Associate Director, Academic Affairs and Policy
		Email:	jimw@wsac.wa.gov
		Phone:	360.753.7890
Synopsis:	<p>Policy options in Demand and Capacity are consequent to success in the other challenge areas of student readiness, affordability, technology, and developing stable funding. If we are successful in these challenge areas, and if we expand outreach to students who have some college but no degree, Washington will have even more competition for limited spaces in postsecondary education.</p> <p>The following policy options were developed by the Workgroup for Council consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitor and report on system-wide programmatic, physical, and technological capacity. 2. Implement a student demand forecasting model. 3. Update and implement the System Design Plan. 4. Add online postsecondary advising system capabilities to ReadySetGrad website. 5. With postsecondary institutions, develop data tools and methodology to contact, advise, and encourage students with some college and no degree to return to complete their credential. 		
Guiding questions:	<p>If everything else we are doing to prepare and encourage students to continue on (or return) to postsecondary education and complete a degree or certificate is successful, what programmatic, physical, and technological capacity will be necessary to meet student demand?</p>		
Possible council action:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Approve/Adopt <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		
Documents and attachments:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brief/Report <input type="checkbox"/> PowerPoint <input type="checkbox"/> Third-party materials <input type="checkbox"/> Other		

Ten-Year Roadmap Policy Options

Challenge Area *Capacity and Success – Increased Demand*

Planning Activity *Strategies to meet the challenge of increased demand for postsecondary education*

Council Lead Members

Scott Brittain
Marty Brown
Ray Lawton

Council Staff

Jim West (Lead), Associate Director of Academic Affairs and Policy
Randy Spaulding, Ph.D., Director of Academic Affairs and Policy
Christy England-Siegerdt, Ph.D. Director of Research and Planning
Daryl Monear, Ph.D., Associate Director for Policy and Research

September 2013

Executive Summary

Washington's postsecondary system faces both challenges and opportunities with respect to growth and capacity. Meeting our state's growing demand will require development of a flexible postsecondary education system responsive to the needs of education consumers, the workforce, and the society served by its graduates.

Policy options in Demand and Capacity are consequent to success in the other challenge areas of student readiness, affordability, technology, and developing stable funding. If we are successful in these challenge areas—and if we expand outreach to students who have some college but no degree—Washington will have even more competition for limited spaces in postsecondary education.

The following policy options address the question: 'If everything else we are doing to prepare and encourage students to continue on or return to postsecondary education and complete a degree or certificate is successful, what programmatic, physical, and technological capacity will be necessary to meet student demand?'

Policy Options for Recommended Action

The following policy options have been developed for Council consideration:

- 1. Monitor and report on system-wide programmatic, physical, and technological capacity.¹**
Outcome: Data on current institutional and system capacity will be provided to the Council for use in developing Strategic Action Plans that implement policy and procedure improvements leading to increased educational attainment in Washington.
- 2. Implement a student demand forecasting model.**
Outcome: Data will be available to inform the Council of comparative impacts on demand and capacity related to policy alternatives from Roadmap areas.
- 3. Update and implement the System Design Plan.^{1,2}**
Outcome: The Council will have an identified process to grow postsecondary capacity as needed in response to improvements in policies and practices outlined in other Roadmap areas.
- 4. Add online postsecondary advising system capabilities to the Ready Set Grad website.**
Outcome: More students will transition efficiently to certificate or degree completion.
- 5. With postsecondary institutions, develop data tools and methodology to contact, advise, and encourage students with some college and no degree to return to complete their credential.**
Outcome: Increase certificate and degree attainment for more than 440,000 adults who have earned some credits and no credential.

Context of the Ten-year Roadmap

Increasing educational attainment is vital to the well-being of Washington residents and to the health of our state and its economy. To this end, the Washington Student Achievement Council is working to propose goals and strategies for increasing educational attainment through a ten-year Roadmap and a two-year Strategic Action Plan.

The Council's Strategic Action Plan, adopted in November 2012, identifies five critical challenges to be addressed in the Roadmap. The five challenge areas are:

1. **Student Readiness** (with four planning activities: Early Learning; Outreach and Support; Alignment; Remedial Postsecondary Education)
2. **Affordability**
3. **Institutional Capacity and Student Success** (with two planning activities: Meeting Increased Demand; Assessment of Student Skills and Knowledge)
4. **Capturing the Potential of Technology**
5. **Stable and Accountable Funding**

To inform the Council's work of creating the first Roadmap, workgroups comprising lead Washington Student Achievement Council members, Council staff, and external workgroup members were formed to research, discuss, and develop issue briefings and policy recommendations for each of these five critical challenge areas.

The challenge areas are complex and interrelated. While the Roadmap will recommend actions for each of the challenge areas, these recommendations will be integrated into a cohesive plan.

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to build on the previous Demand and Capacity Issue Briefing.³ The report highlights policy options for the Council to consider as Action Recommendations for the ten-year Roadmap to raise educational attainment in Washington State.

Washington's postsecondary education system faces both challenges and opportunities with respect to growth and capacity. Meeting our state's growing demand for a skilled and educated workforce will require development of a flexible postsecondary education system responsive to the needs of the education consumer, the workforce, and society.

Policy options in Demand and Capacity are consequent to success in the other challenge areas of Student Readiness (Early Learning, Outreach and Support, Alignment, College Transitional Studies); affordability, technology, and developing stable funding. If we are successful in these challenge areas we will have even more competition for limited spaces in postsecondary education. In addition, outreach to students who have some college credit but no certificate or degree, and an increasing number of adult returning student enrollments, will put increased pressure on the capacity of our systems.

The following policy options address this question: 'If everything else we are doing to prepare and encourage students to continue on or return to postsecondary education and complete a degree or certificate is successful, what programmatic, physical, and technological capacity will be necessary to meet student demand?'

To raise educational attainment in Washington on an order of magnitude necessary to meet the needs of our residents and our economy, we will need to add capacity to our system.

The capacity and demand workgroup reviewed issues explored in the background brief presented to the Council in July 2013, and developed several policy options for the Council's consideration related to capacity and demand.

Policy Options for Recommended Action

The following five policy options are recommended to the Council for consideration. The options are not mutually exclusive and are presented with expected outcomes and a brief explanation.

1. Monitor and report on system-wide programmatic, physical, and technological capacity.⁴

***Outcome:** Data on current institutional and system capacity will be provided to the Council for use in developing Strategic Action Plans that implement policy and procedure improvements leading to increased educational attainment in Washington.*

The Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) previously conducted periodic studies on the state's capital facility and technology capacity. The last system-wide report was completed in 2007-09 through funding provided by the Appropriations Act.⁵ The charge at that time was to estimate the capacity of institutional space and the effect of technology on enrollments and space needs for the period from 2009 to 2019.

In a collaborative effort, HECB staff worked closely with Washington's public four-year higher education institutions, the State Board of Community and Technical Colleges, the Council of Presidents, and the Independent Colleges of Washington to obtain and analyze the information contained in the study.

The major tasks conducted at that time and that would be replicated and expanded for this policy option are:

- Identify the existing physical and programmatic capacity of each institution, branch campus, and education center including factors that have or will impact institutional capacity.
- Identify the degree, certificate, and enrollment plans, by institution: two-year and four-year, public and private, non-profit and for-profit colleges and universities.
- Identify the impact technology has and could have on accommodating future enrollments.
- Determine the capital and operating costs associated with accommodating future enrollments.
- Identify conclusions and policy implications regarding institutional capacity and degree and enrollment plans.

2. Implement a student demand forecasting model.

***Outcome:** Data will be available to inform the Council of comparative impacts on demand and capacity related to policy alternatives from Roadmap areas.*

The model will mathematically describe the relationships between K-12 milestones and later education milestones (e.g. high school graduation, two- and four-year college enrollment, and college completion). The model will allow Council staff to estimate increases in student demand based on percentage changes in milestone indicators. In addition, the Council and staff will use the model to look at impacts for different subsets of students (e.g. by gender, race/ethnicity, and special needs). These relationships will be estimated using ERDC longitudinal data and statistical methods.

The key factors to be considered in the model include drivers of demand and efficiencies. In this context, drivers of demand refer to those things that will increase pressure for more capacity in postsecondary education, while efficiencies refer to those things that should free up space in postsecondary institutions by allowing students to move through the system in less time, or with fewer additional credits.

Drivers of Demand include:

- Increased number of high school graduates, resulting from demographic growth, reduction in the achievement gap, and improvements in academic performance.
- Improved college-going rates due to early interventions like College Bound, GEAR UP, and other successful outreach and support activities.
- Improved retention and completion rates.
- Increased numbers of adult and returning students.

Improved “Efficiency” includes:

- Increased access to dual credit coursework.
- Fewer enrollments in developmental and remedial education.
- Reduced excess credits due to improvements in transfer and advising.
- Increased acceptance and use of Competency Based Education Models (including Prior Learning Assessment).

3. Update and implement the System Design Plan.⁶

***Outcome:** The Council will have an identified process to grow postsecondary capacity as needed in response to improvements in policies and practices outlined in other Roadmap areas.*

The *System Design Plan*⁷ developed in 2009, provides a comprehensive framework for making decisions about how to reach the goal of delivering many more postsecondary credentials and degrees. The Plan offers strategies to address immediate needs and lays the groundwork for rapid improvement as our economy continues to improve. It also aligns with National goals of restoring the U.S. as the best educated nation in the world by 2020.

The plan recommends four key elements:

1. A set of guiding principles on which to base future growth decisions.
2. A near-term strategy to grow enrollment without major capital investment.
3. A new process called ‘Expand on Demand’ for evaluating major new expansion proposals (new branch campuses, capital investment in university centers, new campuses, or major technology innovations).
4. A new *Fund for Innovation* to foster innovation, pilot programs, and partnerships focused on improving access and completion, increasing system productivity, and alternative program delivery.

The *System Design Plan's* recommendations rest on several key concepts:

- First, invest in effective programs to improve the motivation and preparation of K-12 students and young, working-age adults.
- Second, make strategic use of existing capacity at the branch campuses, centers, comprehensive institutions, and independent colleges and their extended sites to broaden the geographic availability of baccalaureate education.
- Third, when new capacity is proposed, employ an 'expand on demand' philosophy, building it only when demand is clearly present. This process would base further growth decisions for higher education on documented evidence that significant numbers of students in a region are ready to attend.

Two innovative components of the System Design Plan include:

▪ **Expand on Demand**

A set of key criteria have been developed to determine when a change of institutional mission is required or substantial new capital expenditures are warranted under the 'Expand on Demand' process. Institutions and/or communities would submit proposals, either developed at their own initiative or in response to Council initiated RFPs, to identify under-served regions and populations or high-need program areas requiring capital investment.

The Council would evaluate the proposals and make a recommendation to the Legislature. If institutional expansion plans did not require new capital investment, existing budget and program approval processes would be employed to determine when and where such expansion could take place.

▪ **Promote innovative ideas**

Achieving goals outlined in the ten-year Roadmap will require efficient and strategic growth throughout the system. To support this growth and improvement, the System Design Plan recommends Washington establish a new Fund for Innovation, which would foster innovation and improvement statewide by providing support for strategies and programs with significant potential to help achieve Roadmap goals.

The new fund would be established in part with seed money provided by state appropriation, which would then be used to leverage additional federal and private foundation support for initiatives designed to increase retention, speed time to degree, increase the number of high demand degrees being conferred, and provide support for other key objectives.

Administered by the Council, the new fund would create a process for competitive grants open to all public and private institutions to foster innovation, collaboration, and system-wide productivity. This Fund for Innovation is modeled after a very successful federal program, *Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education* (FIPSE).

4. Add online postsecondary advising system capabilities to the Ready Set Grad website.

Outcome: *More students will transition efficiently to certificate or degree completion.*

A single source of Transfer and Articulation information does not currently exist in Washington, but the concept has been supported widely across the system for several years. Students, families, faculty, and advisors would use this system to provide access to all course listings, academic program descriptions, course prerequisites, and admission requirements at the public and private four-year colleges and universities.

This addition to the new ReadySetGrad.org website will improve transfer efficiency, reduce the number of excess hours taken, result in greater numbers of degrees earned, and generally make planning for college far less time-consuming.

Potential users include:

- **All high school graduates**
 - **Equity** - All prospective students in Washington will have equal access to college information regardless of size of high school, access to counselors, proximity to a college, or experience with the college going process. First time college students and their families will be on equal footing with more experienced peers.
- **More than 17,000 Advanced Placement (AP)** students take at least one AP exam each year. Students want to know how these courses apply to a degree.
- **More than 16,000 Running Start** students enrolled in Community and Technical Colleges and baccalaureate institutions. This system will help them plan their future.
- **More than 16,000 Community and Technical College** students graduate yearly with transfer associate degrees.

About 70 percent of the students who access higher education in Washington do so first at a two-year institution.⁸ Washington's two-year colleges account for a higher percentage of public and private college student enrollments (49 percent) than in the U.S. in general (34 percent).⁹ Strong transfer policy is critical to student access and completion and an online advising system will aid in student success.

In the 2011-12 academic year 113,697 students indicated intent to transfer from a community or technical college to a baccalaureate institution. In the same year, more than 19,000 students transferred credits from community and technical colleges to public and private baccalaureate programs in Washington. Of these, 13,033 students (68 percent) transferred to the public four-year institutions. Nearly 5,700 students (30 percent), transferred to private four-year institutions. This includes the addition of nearly 1,900 transfer students to Western Governors University in 2011-12.¹⁰

5. With postsecondary institutions, develop data tools and methodology to contact, advise, and encourage students with some college and no degree to return to complete their credential.

***Outcome:** Increase certificate and degree attainment for more than 440,000 adults who have earned some credits and no credential.*

Nearly one million people in Washington between the ages of 25 and 64 have some college but have not completed a degree.¹¹ These adults represent a great deal of untapped potential. Of this group, more than 440,000 Washingtonians age 44 and younger are most likely to enroll. With a past track record of success in college, these younger workers represent a tremendous pool of potential new talent if we can re-engage them and move them successfully through the system.¹²

Although adults in this ‘opportunity population’ may appear readily available and easy to capture and serve, strategies to re-engage these students often meet with limited success. A key characteristic distinguishing reentry adults from other college students is the high likelihood that they are juggling other life roles while attending school, including those of worker, spouse or partner, parent, caregiver, and community member. These multiple roles present challenges in students’ allocation of time for both academic study and participation in campus-based organizations and activities.¹³

Data tools and methodology will be developed to analyze transcript information for students who leave any Washington institution with some college and no degree so that these students can be contacted, advised, and encouraged to return to complete their studies.

Western Washington University completed a *Destination Graduation Program* in 2010 that was successful in reaching out to former WWU students who had most of their degree completed. Support services were provided to assist in removing barriers preventing them from returning to Western to complete their degrees. This program could be a model for implementation at other colleges and universities in Washington.

Next Steps

Following the Council’s consideration and discussion of policy options at its September 2013 meeting, Council staff will integrate Demand Recommendations into the Roadmap framework. The framework for Roadmap Recommendations will outline specific strategic actions, including:

- Expected outcome of the action.
- Action time period.
- Outcome time period.
- Metrics for measuring outcomes.
- Legislative action needed.
- Fiscal impact.

Staff will develop the framework in close consultation with Council members. The Council will use this framework at its October retreat to help shape the Roadmap.

Appendix A

RCW 28B.77.080

Needs assessment process and analysis — Recommendations — Activities requiring council approval.

- (1) The council shall develop a comprehensive and ongoing assessment process to analyze the need for additional degrees and programs, additional off-campus centers and locations for degree programs, and consolidation or elimination of programs by the four-year institutions of higher education. Council recommendations regarding proposed major expansion shall be limited to determinations of whether the major expansion is within the scope indicated in the most recent ten-year plan for higher education or most recent system design plan. Recommendations regarding existing capital prioritization processes are not within the scope of the evaluation of major expansion. Major expansion and proposed mission changes may be proposed by the council, any public institution of higher education, or by a state or local government.
- (2) As part of the needs assessment process, the council shall examine:
 - (a) Projections of student, employer, and community demand for education and degrees, including liberal arts degrees, on a regional and statewide basis;
 - (b) Current and projected degree programs and enrollment at public and private institutions of higher education, by location and mode of service delivery;
 - (c) Data from the workforce training and education coordinating board and the state board for community and technical colleges on the supply and demand for workforce education and certificates and associate degrees; and
 - (d) Recommendations from the technology transformation task force created in chapter 407, Laws of 2009, and institutions of higher education relative to the strategic and operational use of technology in higher education. These and other reports, reviews, and audits shall allow for: The development of enterprise-wide digital information technology across educational sectors, systems, and delivery methods; the integration and streamlining of administrative tools including but not limited to student information management, financial management, payroll, human resources, data collection, reporting, and analysis; and a determination of the costs of multiple technology platforms, systems, and models.
- (3) Every two years the council shall produce, jointly with the state board for community and technical colleges and the workforce training and education coordinating board, an assessment of the number and type of higher education and training credentials required to match employer demand for a skilled and educated workforce. The assessment shall include the number of forecasted net job openings at each level of higher education and training and the number of credentials needed to match the forecast of net job openings.
- (4) The council shall determine whether certain major lines of study or types of degrees, including applied degrees or research-oriented degrees, shall be assigned uniquely to some institutions or institutional sectors in order to create centers of excellence that focus resources and expertise.

- (5) The following activities are subject to approval by the council:
 - (a) Creation of higher education centers and consortia; and
 - (b) New degree programs and creation of off-campus programs by an independent college or university in collaboration with a community or technical college.
- (6) Institutions seeking council approval under this section must demonstrate that the proposal is justified by the needs assessment developed under this section. Institutions must also demonstrate how the proposals align with or implement the ten-year plan for higher education.
- (7) The council shall develop clear guidelines and objective decision-making criteria regarding approval of proposals under this section, which must include review and consultation with the institution and other interested agencies and individuals.
- (8) The council shall periodically recommend consolidation or elimination of programs at the four-year institutions of higher education, based on the needs assessment analysis.
- (9) In the case of a proposed major expansion or mission change, the needs assessment process under subsection (2) of this section constitutes a threshold inquiry. If the council determines that the need for the proposed major expansion or mission change has not been justified, the inquiry is concluded. If the council determines that the need for the proposed major expansion or mission change has been sufficiently established, the council, in consultation with any directly involved institutions and other interested agencies and individuals, shall proceed to examine the viability of the proposal using criteria including, but not limited to:
 - (a) The specific scope of the project including the capital investment requirements, the number of full-time equivalent students anticipated, and the number of academic programs planned;
 - (b) The existence of an efficient and sustainable financial plan;
 - (c) The extent to which existing resources can be leveraged;
 - (d) The current and five-year projected student population, faculty, and staff to support the proposed programs, institution, or innovation;
 - (e) The plans to accommodate expected growth over a twenty-year time frame;
 - (f) The extent to which new or existing partnerships and collaborations are a part of the proposal; and
 - (g) The feasibility of any proposed innovations to accelerate degree production.
- (10) After the council completes its evaluation of the proposed major expansion or mission change using the needs assessment under subsection (2) of this section and viability determination under subsection (9) of this section, the council shall make a recommendation to either proceed, modify, or not proceed with the proposed major expansion or mission change. The council's recommendation shall be presented to the governor and the legislature.

[2012 c 229 § 111; 2010 c 245 § 5; 2005 c 258 § 11; 2004 c 275 § 9. Formerly RCW 28B.76.230.]

Notes:

Findings -- Expand on demand -- System design plan endorsed -- 2010 c 245: See note following RCW 28B.50.020.

Findings--Intent -- 2005 c 258: See note following RCW 28B.45.014.

Part headings not law -- 2004 c 275: See note following RCW 28B.76.090.

Note following RCW 28B.50.020 referenced above:

Findings -- Expand on demand -- System design plan endorsed -- 2010 c 245: "The legislature finds that the state institutions of higher education are providing a high quality education to the citizens of the state. The legislature further finds that to meet goals of the strategic master plan for higher education the state needs a higher education system that is capable of delivering many more degrees. The legislature also finds that expansion of the system should be based on the proven demands of the citizens and the marketplace, a concept called "expand on demand." The legislature further finds that the *higher education coordinating board, in collaboration with the state board for community and technical colleges, the two-year and four-year institutions of higher education, and other stakeholders developed a system design plan that contains seven guiding principles for system expansion, focuses near-term enrollment growth at university branch campuses, comprehensive universities, and university centers where existing capacity is available without new state capital investment, establishes a process for evaluating major new capital expansion, and creates a fund for innovation to foster change and innovation in higher education delivery. The legislature finds that the strategies in the plan support the concept of expand on demand and would increase degree production by first reinvesting in higher education to use existing capacity while also providing long-term strategies to guide decisions on when and where to build new campuses, significantly expand existing sites, and change missions of existing institutions.

The legislature endorses the system design plan, approved by the *higher education coordinating board in November 2009, and adopts the recommendations and strategies in the plan." [2010 c 245 § 1.]

Author Contact Information

Jim West
Associate Director, Academic Affairs and Policy
Washington Student Achievement Council
jimw@wsac.wa.gov
360.753.7890

Acknowledgements

The Council would like to thank the following people for their substantive contributions to the Capacity and Success: Increased Demand Workgroup and to this Policy Brief:

External Workgroup Members

Jane Wall, Council of Presidents
Jane Sherman, Council of Presidents
Philip Ballinger, University of Washington Seattle
David Prince, State Board of Community and Technical Colleges
Darby Kaikkonen, State Board of Community and Technical Colleges
Vi Boyer, Independent Colleges of Washington
Nova Gattman, Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board
Bryan Wilson, Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board
Melissa Beard, Education Research & Data Center
Lorrie Brown, Office of Financial Management
Linda Drake, State Board of Education
Alan Burke, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Dennis Milliken, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Gena Wikstrom, Northwest Career Colleges Federation
Mike Colwell, Department of Corrections
Jean Floten, WGU Washington
Steven Olswang, City University of Seattle
Pamela Goad, Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities
Cynthia Forland, Employment Securities Department

Sources

¹ Policy options 1 and 3 are addressed in Sections (1), (2), (9), and (10) of RCW 28B.77.080 located in Appendix A.

² The [System Design Plan](#), developed in 2009, offered a comprehensive framework for making decisions about how to reach the goal of delivering many more postsecondary credentials and degrees.

³ The Increased Demand Issue Briefing presented to the Washington Student Achievement Council July 17, 2013.
http://www.wsac.wa.gov/sites/default/files/Council-DemandIssueBriefing_0.pdf

⁴ Policy options 1 and 3 are addressed in Sections (1), (2), (9), and (10) of RCW 28B.77.080 located in Appendix A.

⁵ Higher Education Coordinating Board. Enrollment Capacity and Technology Study. MGT of America, Inc. October 2008.

⁶ The [System Design Plan](#), developed in 2009, offered a comprehensive framework for making decisions about how to reach the goal of delivering many more postsecondary credentials and degrees.

⁷ Higher Education Coordinating Board. The System Design Plan.
<http://www.wsac.wa.gov/sites/default/files/ReportSystemDesign-FINAL2010.pdf>

⁸ Source: State Board for Community and Technical Colleges.

⁹ Source: Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board. 2012. Key Facts About Higher Education in Washington. HECB staff analysis of data from Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), National center for Education Statistics, fall 2010.

¹⁰ SBCTC changed how they reported transfer student information this year and included Running Start students with the public baccalaureate data. For this report, complete data was not yet available through the ERDC. SBCTC contacted the public baccalaureates for data and those providing information were included in their report on which this information is based.

¹¹ A Stronger Nation Through Higher Education. Lumina Foundation, 2013.
http://www.luminafoundation.org/stronger_nation/report/#washington

¹² Washington Student Achievement Council staff analysis of American Community Survey 2007-2011 PUMS individual survey for Washington State.

¹³ Ross-Gordon, J. Research on Adult Learners: Supporting the Needs of a Student Population that Is No Longer Nontraditional. *Peer Review*. Winter 2011, Association of American Colleges and Universities. Vol. 13, No. 1.